ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

MAY 10, 1967

Mark Lane

ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

PROCEEDINGS OF

MAY 10, 1967

PRESENT: MR. JIM GARRISON, District Attorney
MESSRS. ALVIN OSER, JAMES ALCOCK, RICHARD BURNES, ANDREW SCIAMBRA and WILLIAM MARTIN, Assistant District Attorneys

MEMBERS OF THE ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

MARK LANE

Reported By:
Maureen B. Thiel,
Secretary
Orleans Parish Grand Jury

MR. MARK LANE, appeared before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury on Wednesday, May 10, 1967.

First I would like to talk about what took place in Dallas on November 23 and what the Warren Commission said. I think the first crucial question, of course, is the question as to where the shots came from. The Warren Commission, of course, said that all of the shots came from the 6th floor window of the Book Depository Building and they were all fired by Lee Oswald. He did it of course by himself. The Commission even went further and said no credible evidence even suggests that any shot came from anywhere else. But when one examines the statements of the witnesses in Dealey Plaza area when shots were fired, one discovers that almost two-thirds of the witnesses who were present and who were asked where the shots came from, and were able to make an answer to say they knew the origin of the shots, 58 out of 90 witnesses said the shots came from here, at least one shot came from here behind this wooden fence high up on a grassyknoll. On the railroad bridge there were a number of employees of the railroad companies in the area, the Dallas police asked S. M. Holland, who has been an employee for at least 41 years at that time and also at that time had served as a deputy sheriff some 17 years, they asked Holland to be up on the railroad bridge about noon, half an hour before the parade arrived, and to see to it that no one other than legitimate railroad employees be allowed up there for obvious reasons.

The parade would pass right under the overpass and it would have been a very serious breach to allow anyone up there who was not known. So Holland was up there at the request of the Dallas police Department and he was to see to it that only legitimate employees of the railroad companies should be permitted up there. He said that when the shots were fired he looked toward the wooden fence at this point, he said I looked in that direction because I know at least one shot came from behind the fence, he said there is no question in my mind, I own rifles, I have done a lot of hunting, shot a lot of pistols and I know that at least one shot came from here, he said when I looked at this point I saw a puff of smoke which appeared to come from behind the wooden fence and drift out in front of these two trees. He also said, when questioned by various officials, if you will question other men up on the railroad bridge, you will hear exactly the same thing. Well that was another mission for the Warren Commissionand the majority of the men on the bridge were never questioned, either by the Commission or by counsel for the Commission. Nevertheless there are now a total of 7 persons, all railroad employees, who are able to state that when the shots were fired I looked toward that wooden fence and each of the 7 said I saw what appeared to be a puff of smoke coming from this area, coming from the area of the wooden fence - some said it to the Commission counsel, some said

it to me in film and tape recorded interviews, a copy of which has been sent to the National Archives so it is now an official document maintained by the U. S. Government. We have at least 7 here taking that position. Back here in the railroad tower was Lee Bowers, Jr., the railroad tower man, he testified that when he appeared before the counsel for the Commission he said something occurred at that wooden fence, he was the one person who was authorized to be behind the fence, he said something occurred at that fence, something which I could not identify specifically, but something - I could not do it then and I cannot do it now - but something which attracted my attention, something that - and after the word 'that'there is a dash and the sentence was never completed, and the Commission lawyer, Joseph Ball, of Long Beach, California, appeared to interrupt him and changed the subject, and while later on Ball did ask him if he had any thing additional to tell the Commission, Bowers said no at that point, but Bowers was never specifically asked again what attracted his attention. Last March/I year ago went to Dallas with a film crew, a director, camera man, assistant camera man, sound technician and others, and I interviewed Lee Bowers, Jr., and I said what happened to that time in your testimony where there is a dash and he said I was interrupted by the Commission lawyer evidently the Commission just did not want to hear it. They did not want to hear it and

there was nothing I could do to tell them that which they did not want to hear but I can tell you that when they stopped me I was going to tell them the facts and I saw something which occurred out of the usual - something that attracted my attention - I could not specifically identify it then and can't now, but it was a puff of smoke, a flash of light, something of that nature which attracted my attention to the wooden fence. Now the Commission knew at the very outset of its investigation that there were persons who said smoke came from behind the wooden fence and it is interesting to see how the Commission handled that allegation in view of their commitment at the outset to the conclusion that Oswald did it and did it alone and was on the 6th floor. Last November I debated with Joseph Ball who was, in fact, the attorney who questioned Mr. Bowers and other witnesses on the scene - just before the Associated Press Managing Convention and this is a transcript of a portion of his remarks and this is what he said. Now this is 2 years after the 26 volumes had been published. Mr. Ball is responding to the point I just made here, and which I made that day there: "What does a puff of smoke mean - does it mean that there is a rifle - of course not, since when did rifles give off a puff of smoke, they don't do it." That is the statement of the attorney for the Commission who questioned witnesses on the scene, rifles do not give off puff of smokes - But if one goes to volume 26 page 811, which is Commission Exhibit 3133, one reads:

about the alleged assassination weapon, a letter from J. Edgar Hoover to J. Lee Rankin, First General Counsel for the Warren Commission, he said the alleged assasination weapon itself was tested to see what its properties and characteristics were when it was fired and he said "a small amount of white smoke was visible when the weapon was fired", so despite the fact that the witnesses saw the puff of smoke come from behind the wooden fence the Commission Counsel, two years after this document was published, insists that no rifle ever emits a puff of smoke. Now further, in terms of determining the Commission's approach to the case, one must examine the dates of this letter, the date on the letter and the date referred to in the letter, the letter written by J. Edgar Hoover on September 23, 1964 and back in November 1963 witnesses were taking about seeing a puff of smoke and no one associated with the Government was ever asked if the alleged assassination weapon emitted a puff of smoke during November or December or the following months until a letter was written to Mr. Hoover, as can be seen by exhibit 3133 by Mr. Rankin and it was written on September 19, 1964, which is 8 days before the Report was officially published, when it was already printed very likely. And the response from Mr. Hoover making reference to the fact the alleged assassination weapon smoked was dated September 24, 4 days before the official publication. The Report was in

the hands of the press 4 days before the release date the Report had not only been printed but had been distributed to the press at the same day that this letter came to the Commission. I think it is an indication of how the Commission met its responsibility.

We now have one man in the railroad tower, 7 men on the railroad bridge indicating that something took place at this point and we have two-thirds of the witnesses in the area saying they believe the shot came from this place at least one shot was fired from there. Now we come to the statement of Charles Graham (phonetically) standing approximately here at the time of the final shot and the one that struck the President. He was on television on November 22 and his name was in almost every leading newspaper which I have seen describing the events of the day because he was very likely the closest spectator to the limousine when the fatal bullet struck the President and what did Graham say, I conducted a film and tape recorded interview and about 3 months after he was dead. The only record of his statement that there was a puff of smoke or flash of light behind the fence, after the Warren Commission's million dollar investigation, and its army of 6000 FBI agents, the only record of what Bowers saw when the shot was fired is the statement he made to me and is now in the National Archives. But the Commission itself never secured it. Now we have Graham who was on television from

the scene, chubby face, and had a little boy with him and he broke down and started to cry from the network, a local interview, I think by WFA, ABC television affiliate, I think it was played around the country. He was the closest spectator when that final shot was fired. In the filmed interview with me he said I saw the effect of the bullet on the President's head, I saw material which he believed to be skull matter which he said was driven backward and to the left of the street and in fact a portion of the President's skull was recovered from that portion of the curb 8 to 12 inches from the south side of Elm Street curb by Dallas Deputy Sheriff Seymour White and gave it to officers and Federal police who gave it to the doctors who conducted the autopsy and confirmed the fact that that portion of the skull had been driven from the President's head.

We now have the indications of the effect of the bullet throwing the skull backward and to the left. Graham also said when I heard the first shot I thought that that shot came from the area over here, one of these two buildings, but I looked up there and that was the Dallas Sheriff's building so I knew that wasn't possible, he said. Graham was wounded twice during the Normandy Invasion and said he had been under fire for a long period of time and he said it was something like swimming, if you

have been swimming for a while and then you don't swim for many years, you may think you have forgotten how to swim but if someone throws you in the water you can start swimming again - now I was under fire and I knew where the shots were coming from. I could have sworn the first shot came from this area = this general area = but the final shot, the effect of the bullet on the President's Head was rather conclusive proof of what Graham saw/corroborate to the fact what other witnesses in the area believed and that is the shot came from here. Now there was Patrolman Smith standing approximately here when the shots were fired went back and was told by some woman, I believe, who said shots came from that area here and he said this was his own judgment at that time and he ran back there and he smelled gun powder behind the wooden fence - he said that to Ronnie Dugger, of the Texas Observer, but when he was questioned by Commission counsel they never asked him the question did he smell gun powder. It was quite obvious as he had already made the statement, that he had smelled gun powder.

Now we have Officer Snowden - we have 17 deputy sheriffs in this general area who ran back, right past the Book Depository Building and concentrated their search back here right behind the fence area - we have in addition of course the photographs taken by the amateur photographer, Abraham Zapruder, and those films Mr. Marcus will go into more fully with you later, but I will just touch on them - this is frame 313 which shows the effect of the

bullet on the President's head and its a little hard to examine the President's posture unless you examine it very closely the black and whites comes from the Warren Commission and they are very difficult to see, the colored photographs are from Life Magazine - Life Magazine owns the Zapruder film. But the position appears to be very similar to the position of 309 as you can see the President is leaning forward at the time of the impact of frame 313. I won't go into the question as to whether there were two bullets that struck him at that time, I think Mr. Marcus will probably raise that question but in terms of the bullet which drove the portion of the skull backward - where that came from just by examining frame 323 or 321 which is not as clear but frame 321 which is a picture taken less than half of a second after this photograph. These frames ran to camera 18.3 frames per second, from this position of leaning forward the President was driven sharply backward and to the left as you can see in frame 323, in fact 321, if you examine it closely you can see the maximum point of which he is being driven backward to the left and he strikes the back of the seat and here, a ninth of a second later, he bounced off the seat. He was driven back with such force. So in addition to the statements of the witnesses we have 9 statements that at least one or more shots here, 7 men on the railroad bridge who saw a puff of smoke, the statement of the one man here who saw something

unusual- a puff of smoke or a flash of light - the statement of Graham, closest spectator - Graham was never called as a witness by the Warren Commission nor was he questioned by counsel for the Warren Commission although it was well known that he was the closest spectator, he was on television and in the press. His indication as to the effect of the bullet on the President's head corroborated with statements of other witnesses and in addition the film taken by Abraham Zapruder, which show that not only is it possible that the President's head was driven backward but the President's body, which is what the Zapruder film showed. The President's body was driven backward and to the left as well. Of course there is a way to resolve this and that is to examine the notes of the physicians, first we have two sets of physicians, we have the doctors at the Parkland Hospital who examined the President while he was still alive and who tried to save him. Every single doctor who examined the President's throat wound at the Hospital and who were present at a press conference later that day and who made a judgment as to the nature of the wound of the President's throat said the President was shot from the front and from above, that the wound in the throat was an entrance wound that had the appearance of being an entrance wound. Some of them were quite explicit about this and explained the characteristics of an entrance wound quite clearly, a small puncture, a penetrating wound whereas an exit

wound was a large jagged wound - one of the doctors said down here in Dallas we have an opportunity every day to examine bullet wounds. Sometimes more than one a day and we know the difference between entrance wounds and exit wounds and the wound in the President's throat was an entrance wound, so we have the statements of the doctors there. Then, of course, the President's body was taken to Bethesda Hospital where he was examined for the autopsy solely by military physicians. But before the physicians began the examination they authorized medical technicians to take photographs, color photographs and black and white photographs and x-rays of the President's body. And Commander J. J. Hume testified before the Commission and he was in charge of the autopsy and as he said before the Commission we find in determining the origin of a missile or a path of a missile in the body photographs and x-rays sometimes to be absolutely invaluable. Not one member of the Commission ever saw the photographs or the x-rays, not one lawyer or staff associate. The photographs and x-rays themselves very likely resolved the question as to whether the bullet came from one direction or the front and from the back. At the present time no one is allowed to see the photographs and the x-rays which remain in the National Archives with a great deal of the other suppressed material. Should the Federal Government decide to

cooperate with you in your effort to discover who killed President Kennedy if they would be good enough to make available to you these invaluable documents, then of course this would be of great value. But I imagine this is unlikely because Commander Humes, when he appeared before the Commission, said to them I thought that you gentlemen might not be able to get the photo= graphs and x-rays, which is a very interesting insight since here was a Commander of the U. S. Navy addressing the Commission appointed by the President of the U. S. headed by the Chief Justice of the U. S. and he presumed that they would not be able to see the relevant evidence. And he was quite right and so he brought with him 3 drawings made by an artist who had never seen the wounds, who had never seen the photographs and x-rays and Commander Humes was asked if the drawings were accurate and that's when he said no, they are not accurate, they could not be because they are based on verbal descriptions, based upon my notes and my recollections and the artist never saw what he was drawing. As soon as the Commission heard that these 3 drawings were not accurate they immediately and solemnly accepted them as evidence, but they never looked at the photographs and the x-rays which would have resolved the question.

Now another basic document which might resolve the question was the original notes of Commander Humes after he completed the autopsy before, perhaps, he knew what the Government's position was going to be but an autopsy report which was probably based on what he saw and his effort to report it. We can't see that either because as he said, I think in vol. 17 page 48, he certified that he destroyed those notes by burning them, so we can't see his notes and we can't see the photographs and x-rays. Perhaps we could take the testimony of Jacquelyn Kennedy, who appeared before the Commission voluntarily and described to the Commission the wounds which she observed her husband had suffered. She was sitting next to him and of all the persons, other than physicians, who examined the President, she was in a better position than anyone else to make a determination as to the nature of the wound and she made her statement voluntarily but the Commission refused to publish it and instead of her description they had bracket reference to wounds illegal bracket - that is probably in the National Archives as well and the transcript of the testimony but it is not in the published material. I should say also that in the published material the first 15 volumes of course comprise the testimony of the witnesses before the Commission, but one should be very careful about that because in vol. 1 the Commission explains that it reserved the right to edit the transcripts prior to publication in order to improve the transcripts for clarity and accuracy. So

what we have in the first 15 volumes is an improved version of what the witnesses said, the original, unimproved, unvarnished version of the response of the witness to the question you would have to get the original transcripts from the Archives, and they are just not available. So there is a great deal of material which indicates exactly where the shots very likely came from which is not available to the people and possibly might be made available to you and if so it would be of great value. Its not that the Commission was unconcerned about medical data in general, for example they published a dental chart showing the condition of Jack Ruby's mother's teeth, which hardly seems to me to be a relevant document, but when it came to the relevant questions photographs and x-rays of the President's body, that material was not available. Now what does the evidence show in terms of the number of shots and the order of the shots. I think the evidence shows that at least 5 shots were fired and they came from at least two different directions. I think the evidence shows that there was one bullet that struck the President in the back, and while we cannot see the original notes of Commander Humes we can see in Commission document 7 in the Archives a document written by two FBI agents, Segrev (phonetically) and O'Neal, and this document was written on November 26, 1963, just

4 days after the autopsy began, the FBI agents indicate that Commander Humes found a wound in the President's back,' which they describe as being 2 inches to the right of the spinal column and beneath the shoulder, somewhere in the right back shoulder region, this is a quote from that doctor on page 284, during the latter stages of that autopsy Dr. Humes located an opening which appeared to be a bullet hole below the shoulders and 2 inches to the right of the middle line of the spinal column. The statement goes on to indicate that Dr. Humes probed the wound with his finger to determine the ejectorate of the bullet and that the bullet had gone but a very short distance into the President's back or shoulder, end of quote - the end of the opening could be felt with the finger. Then Segrev and O'Neal said Dr. Humes was puzzled in that there was no point of exit on the body, the bullet had not exited and the bullet was not present in the wound, the bullet had gone in but a short distance and he could not understand, was at a loss to explain why he could find no bullet. Then phone calls were made by FBI agents to various persons at the laboratory and to Secret Service agents and then the full story was presented to them that evening and that is when the President was at the Parkland Hospital external cardiac massage had been administered to him, his body had been moved roughly and then a bullet shortly thereafter was discovered on the stretcher. Based upon this information the FBI report continued

on page 285, on the basis of the latter two developments Dr. Humes stated that the pattern was clear, the one bullet had entered the President's back and worked its way out of the body during the cardiac massage. The one bullet struck the President in the back, did not go in very deeply and in fact fell out evidently, according to this report, if this report is accurate. We know another bullet struck the President from the front - in the throat - leaving behind the entrance wound. We know at least one bullet missed the occupants and hit the main curb, leaving behind some lead in the curb and causing a portion of the curb, or a portion of the bullet, to ricochet and strike a spectator named James Tague in the face causing the face to bleed, therefore other than the President, who was killed of course, and the Governor , who was seriously wounded, Tague was the only known person to have suffered any wounds at all in Dealey Plaza as a result of the shots being fired. Tague called over Dallas Deputy Sheriff, I think Buddy Walters was his name, and pointed out where the mark in the curb was and I conducted a filmed interview with Tague as well when the shots were fired he was right near the underpass and he believed the shots came from behind the wooden fence. That was his statement/ So we have a bullet striking the President in the back, one in the front and at least one bullet striking Gov. Connally, who suffered many injuries and the Government said it was all done

with one bullet. Perhaps they are right, in any event it was done by one bullet so we now have 4 bullets fired and one bullet struck the President from the front and drove a portion of his skull backward, that was the fatal bullet and drove his body to the rear and to the back as well. Now 5 bullets fired from two different directions, that is a mimimum of 5, and a minimum of two different directions, of course preclude the possibility that Lee Harvey Oswald was the one assassin unless some very sophisticated weapon has been developed which allows one man to fire from two different positions at the same time, which seems very unlikely. Now we have shots coming from at least two directions, which is the Commission's first problem to try and explain how one man from the 6th floor did it all. The second problem is this: the rifle was not physically capable of firing 5 shots in the period of time from the time the first shot was fired to the last shot. The period estimated by the Secret Service and FBI agents, which appears to be corroborated by the examination of the films taken by Zapruder and others as a period of less than 6 seconds, from the first shot to the last shot. Now the problem with that is the alleged assassination weapon was tested by the FBI fire arms expert and he said an absolute minimum required 2.3 seconds just to work the bolt and squeeze the trigger without aiming at a moving target. Aiming at a moving target, he said, you would have to add a second. The Commission then used the lower 2.3 instead of 3.3

and we might just as well. Just to determine the physical speed with which the weapon could be fired, if five shots were fired, the Commission said, the weapon was fully loaded, Oswald was up there waiting for the President and while there was no evidence that it was fully loaded and ready to go, it does sound like a sound presumption to make that if you are there to kill the President your rifle is loaded. All right, 5 shots - and you have to fire 5 shots and the weapon is fully loaded at the outset and there are 4 interval periods - so if there are 5 shots you just multiply 4x2.3 and that gives you the absolute minimum in time of working the bolt, squeezing the trigger but without aiming, too much time - let's try 4 shots, even that - let's try 3 shots, even that - so 5 shots could not be fired, 4 shots could not fired, Maximum number of shots that could be fired with the assassination weapon from the time the first shot was fired until the last was 3 shots, now the Commission has a serious problem trying to find out how one man on the 6th floor of the Book Depository Building could fire 3 shots which resulted in 5 bullets which came from different directions - very difficult task and this is the way the Commission sought to present its case. First shot was fired from here, the live oak tree, by Oswald, just as the limousine appeared and cleared the tree from Oswald's view and the bullet struck in 8/10's of a second after the President was visible to Oswald - all of the shots Oswald fired, the most skillful one

was the first one which was fired in less than 8/10's of a second after the car came into view, and it passed the tree. The first shot, said the Commission, hit the President in the back of the neck thereby leaving behind a wound in the right shoulder, the bullet then proceeded and ripped out the President's Adam's apple where by leaving behind a small entrance wound of the throat - the films show and Gov. Connally shows that he was struck more than one second after the President was struck, according to the Commission's logic evidently the bullet after exiting from the throat leaving behind the entrance wound stopped in midair for about 1 second or a bit more and then began again and struck Gov. Connally in the back, shattered his fifth rib made a right turn and struck his right wrist and ended up in his left thigh which explains why the bullet was found on the President's stretcher according to the inference of the two FBI agents - that was the first bullet. The second one missed hitting any of the occupants and the third one struck the President in the back of the head thereby driving a portion of his skull backwards to the left and driving his body also backwards to the left - that is the Commission's explanation of how one man could have done it. Not it was suggested to the Commission that even that unusual story has more problems than one can imagine. For example, we have the testimony of Roy Kellerman, front right hand Senior Secret

Service agent, he said after the first shot was fired I heard the President say My God, I am hit - he was questioned pretty closely by counsel about that assertion, but they seemed to be aware at that time how difficult that statement would be to accept and also for the Commission's case. Are you sure that was the President? He said, yes, I have been with the President for some time, I know his accent, I knew the person back there, Gov. Connally, who does not talk the same way - he said it was absolutely the President and after the first shot said, My God, I am hit. Let's take the Preident's last words, if Secret Service Agent Kellerman is correct, and see how that can be worked into the Government's explanation. The first bullet hit the President in the back of the neck and ripped out his Adam's apple, clearly the President did not say My God, I am hit before the first bullet struck him, on the other hand he could not have said it after the first bullet struck him if, as the Commission says, it ripped out his Adam's apple. Not in that clear crisp New England accent. So just in terms of witnesses who have established what took place that day, after that last word of the President, those last words are a legacy which prove the fraudulence of the Warren Report. The first bullet hit the President in the back of the shoulder and then he could have said, as Kellerman said, My God, I am hit. When that bullet struck him in the throat he was unable to say

anything, in fact he never said another word. Now you have the testimony of almost every single person who was a witness to rebut the Commission of what happened that day. Governor Connally testified that the bullet which hit the President did not hit him, that is, the first bullet did not hit him. And his wife added that, in fact, the first bullet did hit the President and both said in essence we heard the shot and the Governor turned to his right, he said I know enough about hunting to know that when I heard that first shot it had already hit, because a bullet travels more quickly than sound and when I turned to look at the President I couldn't see him so I started to turn to my left and when he started to face forward he was then struck. But it could not have been the first bullet and Mrs. Connally said the same thing. Jacquelyn Kennedy said we don't know in reference to the wounds and Mr. Kellerman said we know, in terms of the President's last words. So almost every occupant of the limousine rebuts the Commission's conclusions. Now we have an additional problem for the Commission, just in terms of determining whether or not the rifle was capable of doing that which the Commission said it did. Let's presume that the magic bullet could have struck the back of the President and left the wound in the right shoulder and stayed in midair a little while before going on. Even if one accepts those unlikely propositions we come to the question of

whether or not anyone with that weapon could have fired 3 shots as the Commission said, 2 of which hit the target which was the President's head, one at the base of the neck and one higher' up in the head. It has been suggested to the Commission that the way to test this, we knew Oswald's score in the Marine Corps with a rifle for 2 years, fired 191 which is 1.point above the minimum with the lowest qualifications, and as one Marine Corps expert testified that would mean that he was a rather poor shot. So all we have to do is get 100 Marines or a 1000 Marines and put them up in that window and they would fire a little better than Oswald perhaps and give them the rifle and one at a time they could fire at the limousine which has a dummy being towed past the area, of course the Commission rejected that pragmatic test and decided to adopt its own. Of all the extravagant claims made by the Commission perhaps the most extravagant is their statement that they tested the weapon under conditions which simulated the conditions which existed in Dallas on Nov. 22. Lets see how they simulated the conditions - first we know Oswald was a rather poor shot. So to simulate the poor shot they secured the services of the best 3 rifle men available in America, all professional riflemen, two military and one civilian, all of whom have fired literally thousands of rounds of ammunition. Now to simulate Oswald's firing at a moving target, the

Commission had 3 stationary targets built to fire at, to simulate a moving target - how to simulate Oswald firing from the 6th floor of the building they built a perch that was not even 30 feet high, not even half as high as Oswald allegedly was. How to simulate the fact that Oswald's first shot was fired in less than 8/10's of one second required the greatest skill with directions to the 3 riflemen, take as much time as you wish for your first shot and to simulate the fact that the weapon to be used could be the weapon itself, but the riflemen complained that the telescopic sight was not properly aligned and secondly, it wobbled, therefore it was impossible to use. So the Commission permitted a gunsmith to improve the weapon, try to re-align it and to weld 2 metal shins to the telescopic sight and attach them to the rifle. Now the weapon is improved, the experts are firing at the stationary target and are to take as much time as they want for their first shot, and they are not poor shots but excellent shots, and are not firing at the target 60 feet from the ground but 30 feet from the ground. Two of them were unable to fire as quickly as Oswald allegedly did - they took the test three and two of them were unable to fire as quickly as Oswald in each of the two tests, one was able to do it in both of the tests. Now obviously Oswald had available to him the head and neck, and a little more of the President, and the bullets in the shoulder and back would have been of no value so

the target was the President's head, he fired 3 shots, 2 of which struck the President's head, one in the neck - how about the experts under the same circumstances, two of them took the test twice, a total of 18 shots were fired , not one bullet of the 18, not one, hit the target at the neck of at the head, not one out of the 18. The Commission felt this test proved conclusively that Oswald and his weapon had the capability of doing that, which the Commission said it did that day. And so it is with almost every single statement made by the Dommission. The Commission said testimony from the experts is persuasive this is what happened, if you go back to the actual testimony of the witness,the experts, you will find that in every single case the testimony proved just the contrary of that of the Commission. And this was so in the Commission's use of language as well. Where a witness would say one thing, where he was the only witness to his act, that he was the sole judge of what he did, if the Commission required him to say something contrary to what he said, they could not convince him to change his statement then they merely ... then the report said that he said something entirely different. The Commission said that Oswald killed Officer Tippit that same day between 1:15 and 1:16 p.m. The only witness to the activities of Domingo Benivades, was a thoroughly frightened witness - I tried to see him but the Dallas police intervened and

and told him he had better not speak with me,and he finally decided not to. But Benivades was in a pickup truck across the street from where Tippit was killed and he saw a man walk up to Tippit$car, then he saw a man fire the shot which killed Officer Tippit, but he said I hid down in my pickup truck for I was afraid he would come back and shoot me if he thought I had seen this thing. Then I saw him go into a lawn but I thought he was going into a house on a lot to get more bullets and I was afraid so I sat there several minutes, I believe that is the quote, and then when it appeared safe I went out and I saw that Tippit was dead and I used Tippit's radio and I called the Dallas police, so the police were alerted to this crime by Benivades. Now the Commission's problem is this, trying to get Oswald from the scene of the assassination when Officer Tippit was killed, the Commission felt that it knew every step Oswald took and that he was never with anyone else, it was necessary to prove there was no conspiracy and so they went to elaborate pains to prove and say that someone on the bus saw him there and somewhere else, but by doing this they were able to get Oswald to the scene where Tippit was killed between 1:15 and 1:16 and we almost concede, I think, that Tippit was killed before that time Oswald could not have done it, the last 8/10's of a mile which they say he walked from his house to the scene, to the front

of his house last seen by housekeeper, Mrs. Roberts, waiting at a bus stop for a bus which would have taken the opposite direction where Tippit was killed, but the Commission just said that he left his house and immediately walked to where he killed Officer Tippit. But the last 8/10's of a mile constituted almost a world's walking record for Oswald to get from his house to where Tippit was killed. I think the members of the Commission who thoughtfully read the report and signed it would concede that if Tippit were killed before 1:15 Oswald could not have done it because the Commission strained mightily to get him there at 1:15. I tried to do the thing which the Commission said Oswald did - from 12:33 after he shot the President to reach the point where Tippit was killed. It always took me 25 more minutes than it took Oswald to get there to kill Officer Tippit. But let's concede at this point that Oswald could have been there, the Commission would concede, I think, that he would not have been there earlier. Now we know when Benivares called in to the Dallas police on Tippit's radio, we know that because we have the Dallas police radio transcript which shows that it took place after 1:15 and before 1:16 so that's when the call came in. So we go back to Benivades' testimony of what happened, according to the Commission, after Oswald shot tippit - after Tippit was shot - he stayed in his truck for several minutes and he described conduct which takes at

least 5 minutes or 6 minutes, and then he left his truck and he made the radio call to the Dallas police Dispatcher - that sets the killing of Tippit back at about 1/10, the call came in at 1:16 and there was activity after the shooting for at least 5 or 6 minutes which means that Oswald could not even have been on the scene as a spectator, if Benivades is correct. Benivades said I did not rush, that is his quote - you put down Benivades' testimony and you pick up the Warren Report and the Commission was aware of the fact that Benivades did not rush then Oswald could not have killed Tippit. The Commission said that Benivades heard the shot, saw the shooting and rushed to the radio to call the Dallas police. Where the witness was unwilling to change the statement the Commission merely ignored it. And Benivades stated nothing relevant in terms of whether Oswald was on the scene, that is one of the allegations the Commission made which has no citation or reference to the original basic material. I should like to tell you about an experience which I had in New Orleans a little more than a year ago last April. After reading the Warren Report it became apparent to me that Clay Bertrand, whose original real name I did not know, but I read the testimony of Dean Andrews who mentioned Clay Bertrand and it appeared to me that he might have been an important person in the entire episode. So while the name Clay Bertrand did not appear in the Warren Report his name appears in my book which was published

last August before the investigation in New Orleans was under way. Most of our activity in the terms of filming a documentary on the case was based in Dallas, but while we were in Dallas the Director of our film Crew, Neal ? called Dean Andrews and asked him if he would grant us an interview and discuss his statement about Clay bertrand, who was of great interest at this moment. And Andrews agreed - we had a whole film crew with us and we drove up, several members and my wife, our Director - there were 6 or 7 of us altogether and we drove to New Orleans and came to see Mr. Andrews. In his office were a number of witnesses, all of them willing to come forward and repeat what I am saying. Mr. Andrews said he could not go forward with a filmed interview, and we asked him why, he offered to take us around town, show us a good time, he is a very colorful gentleman and we said we were here with one single purpose and that was to have an interview with him, and he said I have just talked to Washington, D. C. by telephone and Washington, D. C. has told me that I cannot talk with you about this. I have been threatened he said and I have been told that a hole will be put in my head if I give you a filmed interview about Bertrand or any other of my testimony. I said we are not investigating the case, we are doing a documentary on what took place, we are looking for no new information from you, we merely assume what you said

to the Warren Commission, under oath, is true and I would merely like to have you repeat portions of it about Bertrand and so forth and he said that is what I cannot tell you. He said, I repeat I cannot tell you,I am threatened and then he repeated the thing about the hole in his head and he said if there is a hole in my head blood will run out and I don't have too much blood to start out with. He went into some details about this and I suppose we remained about ten minutes or fifteen and made every effort to convince him that no harm would come to him but we were unable to do so, so we left and that was out last contact with him. Of course we know that Andrews' position is that he does not know who Clay Bertrand is and he told the Commission that he was looking for Clay Bertrand - saw him in a bar as a matter of fact and went after him but the man had left, he was looking because he had referred a number of homosexual cases and the young men had not paid a fee and therefore he thought that this Bertrand was responsible,to try to get the fee from. He was looking for a period of weeks and could not find this man. On my last visit to New Orleans I met a man named Preston Davis, who told me he was the only investigator for Andrews at that time. He said to me that Andrews never asked him to look for Clay Bertrand, he thought that unusual because if Andrews was looking for anyone the ordinary thing would be to ask Davis conduct the investigation but he said Andrews never asked him - in fact he raised the question that he knew Clay Bertrand was a

fictitious name, in fact knew who the person was - I made a tape recording of that session with Davis, he told me he would not make those statements to the District Attorney but I had a tape recorder going during the interview and I will give you a copy of that, to the District Attorney's Office.

I think that perhaps that might be enough of a formal statements and do you have any questions?

BY A JUROR:

Q. You say how many witnesses say they saw the shots come from the fence as compared with the total number of witnesses?

A. We believe there were from 4 to 500 witnesses in the area. The problem is the Commission never compiled a list of the witnesses and never published a list of the witnesses in the Plaza, that they questioned. Of the 4 to 500 witnesses in the area the majority were never questioned by anybody. Those who were questioned, about 90, and 58 of the 90 said the shots came from behind the fence.

Q. And the remainder - where did they say the shots come from?

A. Some said the shot came from the Book Depository Building, some said from the Dal-Tex Building, many of them said this general area from the back of the limousine, many of those persons who said the shots came from this area were Government officials and after the Governor's case became known their testimony had to be taken and in addition to this it should be remembered that some indication in this kind of case often reveals that

witnesses are sometimes very eager to do that which is expected of them. One witness, for example, said he heard 4 shots in Dealey Plaza and the Government's case contended that only 3 shots were fired and then he said, when again asked how many shots were fired, he said I heard one more shot than was actually fired. That was a documented statement. Chief Curry of the Dallas Police Force said later on that he heard the shots come from the Dallas Book Depository Building and when he was questioned about that he said he could hear it from the 6th floor of that building in this general area but if you examine the Dallas Police radio transcript you can see whre his original position was because he had to pick up the microphone and call in to the Dispatcher and said/get someone up on that overpass area. And Sheriff Decker said the same thing. So their original response was here in this general area - later they said Oswald did it and alone - and changed their basic positions which were here and here.

Q. What influence induced them to change their opinions?

A. Well many of the witnesses were arguing - the FBI agents did not function in this case as purely investigatory force getting the facts and bringing them back - this is a shocking statistic - the fact is that the majority of the witnesses who came before the Warren Commission, were shown FBI reports, of interviews with them by FBI agents, and

when confronted with those reports the majority of witnesses said the FBI report is wrong, I didn't say that. In almost every single case where the witness said the report is wrong I did not say that, the FBI agent's report was consistent with the Government's case. In another case, the case of Nelson Delgado, Delgado was a Marine with Oswald in the Marine Corps and he said two things about Oswald which were relevant, no. 1, Oswald was a poor shot; said Oswald used to fire at the firing line and when you missed the target entirely, not in the bull's eye, not in the line, missed the whole circle, they waved a red flag, he said you don't see much anymore of that in the Marine Corps - they to do something to attract your attention - if you were a poor shot; no. 2, Oswald could speak Spanish, he, Delgado, taught him this and he could get by in conversation. Now both of these conclusions now appear to be consistent with the Commission in that they did not want to believe that Oswald could speak Spanish. Delgado testified before the Commission that the FBI agents badgered him, ordered him to change his testimony in both respects that Oswald was not a poor shot and that he could not speak Spanish and he said I could not say that because I taught him Spanish, then Delgado went on to tell the Commission that the FBI sent a man down to give him a test to see if he, Delgado, could speak Spanish and Delgado was born in Puerto Rico and Spanish is his mother tongue. But he failed the test evidently

and he said well I would like to see that FBI agent go to East Harlem and try to talk to the people there - he said I talk conversational Spanish, my mother taught me, in fact his grade, Delgado's grade in the Marine Corps in Spanish has a letter in it, which was awarded to him because he speaks Spanish. So here is at least one example of a witness who insisted not only was the FBI wrong but that in fact the FBI deliberately and effectively sought to suborn perjury from an important Commission witness who testified to that which he knew to be untrue -

Q. Would you venture an opinion as to why the Commission was so insistent on pinning this thing on one assassin?

A. I think there are probably a number of things. First of all, I think there is one terrible problem in any assassination that you have to deal with, and that is when the President was killed whoever killed him was - if he was normal, or was a school boy - he would know that riding in two cars behind him was a man who would be President as a result of his killing the President. Say he hated Lyndon Johnson, but he hated the President even more. But it raises the question if there was a conspiracy then you have to consider the possibility that the result of the killing of Kennedy would result in Johnson being President - an inadmissible

thought - I think that the most innocent explanation therefore one man did it, he was insane, he was looking for his place in history, and a conspiracy of course is just two or more people acting in concert . Then you have to ask why did they do it? The reasons? I think the new evidence uncovered here in New Orleans indicates very active involvement in terms of relationships, CIA, FBI, and in terms of their relationships with people who played a part of the November 22 activities and that, of course, is more than the administration wants to discuss at all. Just say Oswald did it and alone and the case is closed, but the problems that it raises, and the questions it raises, more than it resolves, and now an investigation is taking place and the Report cannot stand a very serious investigation. The hearing should have been conducted as a trial and it could not stand an investigation. As written therefore there was no evidence, no procedure so the final irony of it was the purpose of the Report, still all doubts because it is a false Report. I have traveled around the country the last 3 years discussing this case and I think I know what the general response is, and I have spoken to more than 150 universities in the U. S., more than 500 radio and television stations, more than that have contacted me and none believes that Report any longer. In fact, that there is a false Report has raised more speculation and conjecture than the result of a truthful report telling whatever the facts are. Truth would have satisfied

the American people. They don't have it there and they are looking for truth. They would like to know who killed their President, but there is nobody to tell them but Mr. Garrison, and his staff.

BY A JUROR:

Q. When you speak of the fact that the FBI people obviously suggested testimony and badgered witnesses, etc., did these agents sort of dream these things up without direction? You have to finally come to the conclusion that with direction . . . were they directed and by whom?

A. Well, It may not be quite that simple. They were directed by the head of their agency. On the other hand, once the Government takes a position this man did it and did it alone, that position can very quickly go, or filter, down to the investigators who understand what is required of them, to bring in evidence which is consistent with that conclusion. I don't think there was a written directive sent down by Mr. Hoover to the agents ignore everything that does not point to Oswald, there was a general feeling that prevailed. Mr. Hoover went very far in his activities but he went this far - that every single lecture which I gave, the time the Commission was appointed until the time that it issued its report, and those are the only files which we have access to, there were FBI agents at every lecture that I gave, one would say Mr, Kane spoke in San Francisco, in 3 days he spoke at 5 universities, we enclose 21 reels of tape - they were travelling all around the

country recording everything I had to say although I had already testified twice before the Commission and told them everything that I knew. Further than that, when my book was completed, I sent it to a publisher and they agreed to publish it, and in a short period of time they said they could not publish it, sorry, and I said why, and they said well we don't think it will sell enough copies to break even - I said how many copies must you sell and they said 5000. I said, well, I don't have any money because I have two years in this case but I will take a bank loan and I will borrow and buy 5000 copies and sell on street corners if I have to, and they said no, we are not going to publish it, we cannot, period. The next year I went to 15 of the leading publishers in the country, everyone said they would like to publish it, they submitted it to their lawyers, checked the 5000 citations made and reference in the back of the work, said it was sound and that they would publish it - and within a week or ten days sorry we cannot. And finally one company/Holt, Rinehart & Winston agreed to publish the book. After they did, now I don't know what other experiences the other publishers had, but I do know what happened to Holt because they told me. The Assistant Directorof the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Dick Derocher, second to Hoover, called in Frank Close, one of the executors of Holt, Rinehart & Winston, to the FBI office in Manhattan and told him that Holt should not publish my book, that

J. Edgar Hoover and the Bureau, the FBI, did not want this book published. I think that is an indication, of course, that the FBI would prefer to be above criticism. I think it is very serious - the book was published and I am very pleased that it was. It was published despite the warning of the FBI. The Assistant Director of the FBI gave a warning to one of the executors of one of the biggest publishing houses in America and told them not to publish a book - how do you think some of the witnesses in Dealey Plaza, or Nelson Delgado, who is in the Army, how do you think these people would generally respond to an investigator who comes with a commitment of a specific view. This I think was the basic problem. The FBI came with its commitment and many of the witnesses understood the commitment and they did not - they were just badgered until they accepted it. Of they were people like Charles Graham, who was on television on November 22, whose statements were contrary to the Commission, and they were just never called. Graham was not called, Mr. and Mrs. Newman were not called. He got newsreel footage from WFAT and he was standing right here - right here - they were on television together I think it was about 10 minutes after the shots were fired, they were rushed to the studio, right over there. And they were questioned and they said the shots came from behind the fence right back in this area. The first witness I know to speak publicly - and they were never called as witnesses by the

Warren Commission. At the base of the hill Mary Woodward and three other employees of the Dallas Morning News, they wrote an article later that day , a horrible ear-shattering sound coming from directly behind them, indicating the wooden fence, their names were there and they knew where they were employed but they were never called as witnesses by the Commission, never questioned by counsel. And so it went. The majority of the cases where witnesses had statements to make which were contrary to the Commission's preconceptions, they were just not called. O. D. Campbell, Vice President of the Book Depository was standing near the building, said the shots did not come from our building, I would have known that, they came from the area of the railroad yard in the general direction from behind the wooden fence. He said that - and he was never called by the Commission. When a witness had to be called/an effort would be made to change the statement ~~testimony~~ of the witness. Dean Andrews was a perfect example of a witness - he said that the FBI sought to convince him that there was no such person as Bertrand, that in fact he never received a phone call on November 23, and he said that, the FBI sought to convince him. And he said not only did he have a phone call from Bertrand but that later on he actually saw Bertrand after that, saw him in a bar some six weeks before hetestified before the Commission. The FBI in its report said it was a figment of

his imagination, he never really received a phone call. The Warren Report was issued in September of 1964 and they said the same thing, he thought he received a phone call but he was under heavy sedation at the time and then the day after Shaw was arrested the Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, said the FBI cleared him, Shaw, back in November and December of '63. Well, why did his name come up at all, they didn't clear 190 million people, obviously something must have been said if they indeed cleared him, but it wasn't because of the Bertrand allegation they cleared him because the FBI subsequent to that time wrote its report and said there was no such person and the Warren Report written in September 1964 implies very strongly that there was no such person. I would give anything to ask Ramsey Clark did you really clear Clay Shaw in 1963, clear him of what? What was the charge, and if you cleared him why did the FBI insist after that that, if you cleared him that he was not Bertrand, why did the FBI insist after there was no such person and why did the Warren Report imply there was no such person. They would be marvelous questions to ask Mr. Clark.

BY A JUROR:

Q. The remark you made about the pressure being brought by the FBI and I am sure you must have made this in some of your other addresses, have they ever challenged you on this? Have they ever answered this charge?

A. Never, they never have answered this charge. In fact I said that in an interview in a magazine which has a circulation of 14 or 15 million people, and there has been no response whatsoever.

Q. Did you ask Pete DeLoach?

A. No, I don't know him personally, but I would like to know his response. But Frank Close, who is the executive with Holt, knows him, and reported this back, information which he must share with his colleagues and they met and discussed it - I discussed this with the Editor-in-Chief and he said we wanted to publish the book before and we want to publish it even more now. We cannot allow the Federal Government to interfere with private enterprise - we want to publish this book and even though we take a different position we cannot allow the Government to interfere in spite of a different position.

Q. Has any pressure been brought to bear on this publisher since they published the book? Did they have any Government contracts?

A. They have now been acquired by CBS, and there are many changes - and I don't know what the relationship is now.

Q. What is your circulation now?

A. The book was published in hard cover and I think they published a quarter million copies and its now out in paper back - it was the no. 1 best selling book which makes very suspicious the statements by the publishers that they didn't think it

would sell. It sold 5000 copies the first day it was published and it sold close to quarter million copies in hard covers and now its out in paper back. It was the no. 1 best selling book in hard covers and its now the no. 1 best seller in paper back and there have been 875,000 sold so far - so its sold over a million copies and it was only published in August.

Q. Mr. Lane, do you have any reason to believe why the FBI would try to cover up this?

A. I think there is very strong evidence, of course . . . this question should be put to Regis Kennedy . . . but I think there is strong evidence that the FBI, the CIA involvement with persons who were involved, way back, in this assassination. And I presume this is an area they preferred not to be made public.

Q. That is why they have all this stuff put away so that this generation can't see it.

A. I presume that is the reason. There are a number of designations as to why material has been classified - page 47 of Oswald's notebook says it is classified for reasons for National security. Garrison said he is such a loner it is amazing that he carried such a notebook with information in it that would raise questions of National security in regard to his relationship and I think there is very strong evidence to indicate that there is a Government connection with Oswald and with many other persons involved in various activities prior to this assassination.

Q. Well from this whole situation I have come to the conclusion, right or wrong, that almost immediately with the sound of the shot that killed the President, the machinery went in motion to find a fall guy in the form of Oswald.

A. Almost immediately this machinery had to be set up for this pigeon before they fired a shot - that would be my conclusion.

Q. How many witnesses have you interviewed? Approximately?

A. About 50 - witnesses to various things.

Q. Are some of these witnesses now dead?

A. Oh yes, a number of witnesses have died. Some of the deaths appear to be mysterious and some appear to be related to what they saw of heard. There are others who say 20 people died because of what they knew. But 20 is like any other number, its an objective statement and I think one cannot come up with an objective number because there are so many objective considerations, for example, the first question, is the death mysterious and the second question, did the person have some really exclusive knowledge, which related him or her to the case. Let me give you one example which I think raises serious questions - and there are dozens other similar examples. Warren Reynolds was a witness to an aspect of the murder of Patrolman Tippit, he worked at the Johnny Reynolds Motor Co. about block and half

from where Tippit was killed, he heard the shot, ran out and saw a man running past his place of business with a pistol in his hand which he appeared to be loading as he ran. He followed the man, gingerly at a distance, and lost him in the parking place, or lot, he talked to the police that day, we had the newsreel footage, he was on television on the scene and described the man. He was not questioned by the Federal police, the FBI or the Secret Service until January 21, 1964 although here was a man who was an important witness, he had seen a man fleeing the scene of the murder with a murder weapon in his hand - well he was questioned on January 21, 1964 by an FBI agent who showed him pictures of Oswald but he said he could not say that was the man who was fleeing from the scene. Two nights later he was shot through the head and the bullet entered his right temple, lodged below the left portion of his jaw, he was rushed to the hospital. . .

Q. Could he describe the man who shot him?

A. Dark skin, Latin type.

Q. Spanish type?

A. Yes. He lived, that's how we know. He was in the hospital, it was presumed that he would die - this was 2 days after he told the FBI that he could not identify the man as Oswald and I questioned him very thoroughly about who knew what he told the FBI and he said nobody but his family, and he did not know how

anyone could have known that, it must have come through some Government Agency. In any event a man was picked up and charged with the crime after he had gone all over Florida and Dallas bragging that he had shot the witness, Reynolds, he said in fact that he called the sister long distance and said he shot Reynolds and he was becomming somewhat of an embarrassment, I should think, to the Dallas police, so they picked him up and finally he said he had an alibi witness, Betty McDonald, and she would come in and testify that she was with him and he did not do it. She was a stripper and worked for Jack Ruby. She came in and said I was with him when Reynolds was shot and he did not do it, and they dropped the charges against Reynolds and he disappeared. The last time I heard, and I think it was about 6 months ago, I talked to Pen Jones, the Editor of the local Mirror and he had been trying to find that gentleman since that time and said he had left Dallas and he could not trace him at all. Eight days later the girl who made the statement which freed that man, was arrested for quarreling with her roommate and - the roommate was not arrested, she was arrested - and the police announced that within one hour after her arrest she hung herself in the Dallas jail. The charge was only disorderly conduct, it was not a very serious crime, but she was dead. So then we have one man shot through the head, one man disappearing and one girl hanged herself

This is typical of about 8 or 10 others. I know the effectiveness of this, I know how it affects people like Lauren Brown, for example, just a short time before the assassination, I think itwas about 2 weeks before, a man who said his name was Lee Oswald went into an automobile dealer, Lincoln-Mercury, I think, - and the Commission never points out how close that is to the Book Depository Building where Oswald worked - its right down here, and he went right in there and he said he wanted to buy a car and he got a hardtop Mercury Caliente, red, took it out and test drove it and he went very fast, there are those who say he drove 70 miles an hour and those who say he drove 100 miles an hour - the salesman came back and said I will never again allow anyone to testdrive a car, I'll do the driving. And he gave his name, the gentleman who drove the car, as Lee Oswald, and the man went to another salesman and said just in case he comes in when I am out if you take it we will share the commission, so he wrote down the name Lee Oswald, so two people have the cards in his own handwriting. That happened two weeks before the assassination. And the man identified himself as Lee Oswald, then said I would like to get some credit but I have a new job and they decided they could not give him credit and he said well I may have to go back to Russia to get a car, then he said

never mind I'll have a lot of cash coming in, and this was two weeks before the assassination. The gentlemen involved were shown a picture of Lee Oswald and said this is the man they saw - one of the men, Bogart, was very badly beaten up in the Dallas area but by the time I got there I talked to his supervisor, Frank Piso, and his colleague, Warren Brown, and they were afraid to talk to me. Brown came over and I had long conversations with Brown and he said look Bogard nearly got killed and if anyone sees anything, which is inconvenient, is in trouble, and I would just not want to be in this particular case. He finally agreed to an interview but in many things and cases the witnesses would not because of things that took place. Now whether there was an organized campaign of terror or not is hard to know but a number of important witnesses did say they received threatening - threats of many kinds - one woman, Mrs. Tice, who had very little to offer in this thing except that Ruby was at the Parkland Hospital when the President was - and the Commission said he was not there. Mrs. Tice saw him there, and Seth Cantor, a very reputable Scripps-Howard reporter, saw him there, and Mrs. Tice was going to testify to this and she received a threatening call and was told to keep her mouth shut, and she wanted to testify before the Commission and they did not want to take her testi-

mony. And one night when her husband was out, one of her doors got barricaded and the other had a ladder placed against it, the phone started ringing and there was no answer, the doorbell rang and she could not get out of the house, she called the police and she called her husband. There were many many such incidences.

Of course if Oswald did it, and did it alone, it is difficult to imagine who was left behind after Oswald's death to raise these questions with the surviving witnesses.

Q. Would you say that because of all these things happening to people the purge is still going on?

A. I talked to Harold Williams, a man who was arrested in Dallas at a club and he said that he was driven to the scene, a short while before the assassination, and to the police station by Officer Tippit and sitting alongside him was Jack Ruby, he said. He knew Ruby because Ruby had furnished girls for the club. After the assassination when he saw Tippit on television he started talking about this with Neiman Marcus, of the store, and his supervisor called and said you had better not be talking about this, it could be embarrassing and he was called in by the police and Capt. Fritz or Sheriff Decker, one of the two, and they told him that he had better forget this statement or otherwise he would be charged with narcotics and we will make this charge stick. This after a tie-in of Ruby with Tippit - and this happened in numerous cases.

JUROR:

Would you venture from what you said about what is happening to a number of people that the conspiracy is still going on?

A Suppressing information? Yes.

Q. I mean if they are still killing people.....

A. I think these deaths are related to what these people saw - it appears to be related and I should not be surprised if some of the activity continues - that perhaps it no longer has to continue - those witnesses who have valuable information are just no longer with us or have reached the conclusion that they should not talk. We see various kinds of activity of this nature - it doesn't have to cloak a conspiracy any longer - Newsweek Magazine, in an article, winds up by asking how much longer the press of the Nation will permit this investigation to continue. Who ever heard of that question being posed. What right does the press of the nation have to do with a Grand Jury investigation? That is all part of - what I would not call a conspiracy, but part of this kind of activity which makes it very difficult.

Q. It seems to be conspiracy if what you say is true?

A. It is true.

Q. Mr. Lane, about the railroad men, did you question them?

A. Yes, a number of times. I questioned James Leon Simmons who was right up there with Holland, and he said exactly the same thing, we had an interview with him on film. I questioned R. C. Dodd, another railroad employee, and he said exactly the same thing. Railroad employees and a number of others were called by investigators and 7 of them have taken that position, that they looked in that direction and each of the 7 say they saw a puff of smoke and an interesting thing, if indeed there was a puff of smoke from a weapon fired from behind the fence, almost the only people to see it would be - because of the buildings, the landscape, et cetera would be Mr. Bowers, who was behind here and who was here and these men over here, almost no one would be in a position here to see, but perhaps here an employee of the Government, J. C. Price, said in fact a man ran behind the area after the shot was fired and run behind the Book Depository.

Q. Mr. Weisberg, I believe, has a picture in Whitewash I or II which might indicate there was someone in the 2nd floor of the building where Zapruder had his office. The Dal-Tex Building . . . Has there been any evidence uncovered . . .

A. I don't think there is any corroborating evidence to show that. And I think the picture speaks for itself. One is entitled to their conclusion but I am not certain that . . .

Q. But you have not uncovered anything that would indicate ...

A. No, we haven't had anything to corroborate that.

Q. The projection outside the window. Mr. Weisberg himself raised an objection - an arm like device . . . he didn't make any claim . . .

A. I happened to have a very large blowup and it is fairly clear and it is an arm

Q. Someone was on the fire escape?

A. Someone was there.

Q. BY MR. GARRISON:

Mr. Lane would you tell the Jury what happend in the questioning of Nancy Rich - when it began to reach the point where Jack Ruby's connection with Cuba?

A. Nancy Rich was an employee of Jack Ruby's, she worked as a bartender, she was almost a manager, her testimony is interesting because it established the relation between Ruby and the Dallas police. That kind of relationship is not unusual in Dallas between a bar owner and police, who come in and get free drinks, et cetera, but theCommission in seeking to show that that was not the relationship said that the police - very few of them - knew Jack Ruby, they used the estimate of between 20 and 50 police officers knew him and he used to give them soft drinks and coffee. But she testified it was more than sofe drinks and coffee - it was liquor - and continual and they made

special efforts and as a result Ruby was permitted to run a much rougher type club, and stay open later and serve drinks after hours. Then she also testified - establishing her relationship with Jack Ruby - and knowledge of the circumstances - and this received the corroboration of others from Joe Johnson, who was Jack Ruby's bank leader at the Vegas Club, another club which he owned, and he was there, I think, some six years, and he indicated that the police came in there regularlyand he treated them royally, et cetera. Amost everything that Nancy Rich said received corroboration from one person or another. She was asked by a group of persons, including an Army Lt. Col. or an Air Force Col, she wasn't sure, her husband was really asked, Robert Perry, who previously had run guns for Franco, if he would become involved in activities of running guns for Cuba, presumably she now thinks for Castro and also to bring exiles out. First it was told bring out exiles, but later as the meeting progressed he was told about the guns as well. She said there was a meeting when it appeared that there was no money available for this and in walked Jack Ruby, whom she knew well as she was employed by him, and Ruby had a bulge in his pocket which she presumed might have been a pistol at that time, but he went to the back room with the Col. and there were Spanish speaking people there , a rather husky,

tough Spanish person there, and others, and Ruby went in the back room and came out without the bulge and every - one was very happy, she said, and it was her conclusion that Ruby had brought the money and delivered it from someone and delivered it to this group. She also went on to say that she had wanted to know at one point whether this was a serious operation or were they just playing games and the Lt. Col. said Let's go down and I will show you something and he took her to a place in the building, the basement I think she said, an arms cache, where she said she saw land torpedoes, and machine guns and sub-machine guns and she said I actually picked up a hand granade - and she said I remember that very well as it is the only time in my life I ever held a hand granade in my hand. I told her ... and she said at that time, when she had actually seen the weapons, and had described them, the Commission order said off the record. Mr. Griffin, an attorney, said well you know I read your testimony and there is no such record published and she said I wouldn't be surprised - and he said strike that off the record. That was what the Commission meant evidently - Vol. 1 when they said they did not publish the transcript of the first 15 Vols. of what they said, the witnesses said, but they reserved the right to edit the transcript to the accuracy and clarity of the witnesses' statements. I prefer the old un-

varnished, un-edited version. It is interesting to know how the Commission handled Nancy Rich's testimony as of great significance. And it must be either accepted or rejected by the Commission after a thorough investigation because the questions she raised are of great moment. The Commission ignored her. In the 888 page document there is a list of witnesses who appeared before the Commission and her was there. But that is the only reference to her. Even in the back of the book where there is a reference to every single person who is referred to by name anywhere in the testimony - there is no reference whatsoever, they don't even have her name in the index in the back of the book. So thatthey completely ignored her, as if she did not exist.

Q. Mr. Lane, didn't you say that the deputy that was supposed to be guarding the entrance to the basement where Oswald was killed that he was talking to some friend of his at that time and Jack Ruby entered the basement, and he did not even challenge him.

N.J.

A. Right. This is the testimony of/Daniels, prior to that time he was a police officer serving in Dallas, and he was driving down Main St. and going to look at the scene of the assassination two days after it happened, before 11:00 o'clock on November 24, and as he passed the police station he saw a crowd outside

he was surprised because he thought that Oswald was going to be transferred at 10:00 o'clock that morning, that was the announcement by police officials Decker and Curry, that Oswald would be transferred at 10:00. It was well after 10:00 and the crowd was outside so he parked his car and decided to look and walk in to see what he could see about the transfer. He came across Roy Vaughn standing in front of the Main Street ramp to the basement of the Police Department, and he said what are you doing here and Vaughn said my job is to keep everybody out. And he knew, as he had been a police officer, and he stood with him and talked with him. Now the Commission gives the impression that Ruby slipped in un-noticed, that this is a huge cavern - the whole thing is only 9 feet wide, and 2 men standing in between - I guess 9 feet is not much more than from this wall to the other - and you can see 2 men standing in the middle that it would be impossible to enter unnoticed. Daniels said he saw a man, who he later identified as Ruby and he did not know him at that time, come charging toward him, hand in pocket like this, a big bulge, of course I presume he had a gun in the pocket but Ruby looked straight at the police officer who was on guard and Mr. Vaughn looked at him - and he permitted him to enter. Ruby went down in

the basement and the radio and video pick up the rest of the story. Soon as Ruby is down there there was a blast on an automobile horn, which is very visible, just as Oswald is led out from the elevator by the police officials and then there is another blast, and just immediately following that second blast, Ruby is seen charging forward and firing one shot - Oswald, of course, put his hands over his abdomen where the bullet was directed, and of course he died at that time. Obviously some questions must be resolved: how did Ruby get in the place; who blew the automobile horns, the only vehicles in the basement were Dallas police vehicles, why were the horns blown? Is this a coincidence - the relationship between the sound of the horns and the activity took place just before ? The Commission never asked the question. Never found out who blew the horns and never asked

Q. To get back to Dean Andrews - You said when you talked to him on the telephone he had agreed to give you an interview and discuss things with you?

A. He talked to D'Antonio, the director of our film company, and he agreed at that time - and based upon that agreement we actually drove from Dallas to New Orleans.

Q. And on your arrival in New Orleans he told you he had been told from Washington he would get a hole in the head if he did it?

A. Yes.

Q. He told this directly to you?

A. He said it in his office in the Maison Blanche Building to me and D'Antonio also in the presence of my wife, Terry Brook, a camera man named Robert Primes, the Assistant Director named Richard Stark, sound man named Paul Milche, an assistant I think was in the room at the time but I am not certain, his name escapes me. His name, of course, I can secure. Those whose names I have given you were all present when he made the statement to all of us present, he actually directed it to me but it was in one glass room, his waiting room, and he came out of his little/enclosed area and came into the waiting room where we were all gathered around, some of us standing, and that is what he related to us, or said to us.

Q. Just a question of conjecture - do you have any personal opinion as to why Officer Tippit might have been killed?

A. I really don't know. And I wouldn't care to guess.

Q. Do you have a personal opinion as to whether or not the Warren Commission acting as such deliberately allowed the Report to be edited the way it was or was the Warren Commission, the investigating body, deliberately did not disclose the information?

A. I think it was really part of each. I think obviously

the investigating parties were not friendly with the Warren Commission, but there is no question about that. But the Commission itself knew that that might well be a problem, they said it at the outset they were not going to rely on the Federal Agencies and they would have their own investigators and they did not ~~xxx~~ rely on the FBI or the Secret Service, the Dallas police and the Dallas Sheriff's department. That was the first indication of the Commission's general approach and read the interview with J. Lee Rankin, Commission General Consel, published in the New York Times, I think, on January 12, 1964, the first interview with any member of counsel for the Commission in which he said our job is to secure the facts and we are going to establish 6 panels to which all the evidence will come and these will be the 6 panels - no. 1, what did Oswald do on Nov. 22; no. 2, Oswald's background; no. 3,Owsald in Russia and Oswald in the Marine Corps; no. 4, How did Ruby kill Oswald; and 5, Ruby's background; and 6, Security, precautions, were they adequate or not. When I talked with members of the Commission I suggested that they might even have established a 7th panel as well which might be called Who Assassinated President Kennedy. Because if any evidence

came to them and indicated anyone other than Lee Harvey Oswald did it, panel no. 1, what did Oswald do on Nove. 22 - they would not take the information. If a man came forward and said all right I was behind the wooden fence, here is my confession, I fired some shots - there was no one to refer him to. I don't doubt they would have handled the situation somehow, but I think this is an indication of what their approach was. Mr. Rankin was quite active in the investigation, Mr. Redlich was also very active, Mr. Goldberg was also very active, I understand the Chief Justice was very active as well. I think many members of the Commission had not the faintest idea what was in the Warren Report, I think Congressman Boggs, who signed the Report, has not the faintest idea of the document, I think that this is certainly true of Senator Russel, who, I believe, is a good trial lawyer but when he was questioning Marina Oswald in September just before the Report came out, he was very concerned about a number of things and asked excellent questions but had no idea what had happened 10 months, 9 months which preceded his initial entrance into the case. I think part of the problem was that we had 7 men who had full time occupations, being Chief Justice of the U.S., being Chief Whip of the Democratic Party, they are not the kind of job you can give up for 10 months. It took me over a

year to read the material in the 26 volumes. The material wasn't even published until Nov. and most of it was not available even - a lot of it was not available when the Commission issued its report. Some of this material came in afterwards. If the members of the Commission resigned from their then present occupations and did nothing but go over all the evidence they could not have been familiar with it enough to have written the Report in September, 1964 and they didn't do that. It was a very small part-time operation and they lent their prestige to the Report and generally little more than their prestige. I don't know how many members knew - take for example, a book written by Congressman Ford "Portrait of an Assassin", its a general re-hash of the psychological data about Lee Harvey Oswald showing - and I have heard it was not really acceptable to his publishers, Simon & Schuster, because there was nothing in there and so he decided to write a new first chapter for it called The Commission Gets Its First Shot. The Commission probably got a first shot when they read that first chapter. Because what Congressman Ford did was to publish top secret minutes of one of the Commission's early meetings which I presume are in the Archives, but it is there in Congressman Ford's book. It tells about that first meeting and at the first

meeting, he said, there was J. Lee Rankin, head of the Commission and he had very serious news for us, Lee Harvey Oswald was an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation an employee of the FBI, he was told this by two people, the Attorney General of Texas, Waggoner McCullough, and by the District Attorney of Dallas, Henry Wade, who himself had previously been an agent of the FBI, and Rankin came with this very sombre news and said in fact his income was $200.00 a month, they knew the date when he was hired , he was on the payroll when he was shot to death in Dallas' police basement and they even knew the number assigned to him as an official number. Then Rankin said according to the transcript published by Ford, this is a dirty rumor which must be destroyed at all costs, not a serious allegation which must be thoroughly investigated, but a very dirty rumor but it was untrue and the two highest officials, in terms of prosecutors in Texas said it was true, then you could see the Commission members' response , some of them said I know Mr. Hoover very well, if he said to me that Oswald did not work for him that would be good enough, but we have another responsibility - not just to convince ourselves, a very serious obligation, we cannot rely upon the statements made by heads of Government Agencies, we must conduct our own investigation and everyone agrees, even the Chief Justice said well, what are the sources,

and someone said Alonzo Hudkins, reporter for a Dallas paper, was one of the sources and the Chief Justice said well he might rely on his newspaper man's privilege, I don't know what he means by that, I don't think there is such a privilege, in any event he said if he did we would have to use some pressure talk to his publisher and try to get him to give us this information. They went over all the sources of the information that Oswald had worked for the FBI. Congressman Ford ends his first chapter by saying never before in the history of America was a crime so thoroughly investigated, now let's put down Congressman Ford's book and pick up the Warren Commission Report, 126 volumes, the very persons who were agreed unanimously by the Commission who were to be questioned about the source of this were never questioned, not one of them was ever questioned. Except J. Edgar Hoover - was Oswald an agent of yours when he killed the President - of course not. And that disposed of the whole matter. I don't think Congressman Ford could have published that as his first chapter and to the conclusion that it was a very thorough investigation if he had the faintest idea that the whole agreement by the Commission members was completely abrogated, in terms of action. I think that was the problem at the present

time and one cannot get a dialogue with any of the Commission members and the reason is their report is indefensible, that is the second reason the first reason is they'don't know what is in there, they couldn't possibly discuss it because they probably have never read it and they certainly don't have any evidence, that is quite clear. This is the problem even after the Report was issued and after the questions were raised even then the lawyers for the Commission, some of them trying to defend them today have not yet done their homework and its 3 years - its time they found out who killed the President.

JUROR:

Mr. Lane, Getting back to Jack Ruby, it appears that he wanted publicity yet he went to his death bed saying I am not involved in this?

A. There is a question in my mind about what Ruby said on his death bed. I recently spoke with ... - none of us were there, the press was not there, Ruby himself was questioned only in the Dallas Police Station, and Ruby said if you take me to Washington, gentlemen, I think the most pitiful testimony of all - take me to Washington and I will tell you what I know about the case. I am afraid to speak here. He says it is not because of the death penalty, I am afraid to speak here. There is another reason why I cannot speak here. The Chief Justice said well, it is getting time for lunch and then we have to break, and after that we are going back to Washington and we won't have time to make arrangements to

being you back. And further, he said, if you feel that anything you might say here will in any way endanger you, then I advise you not to say it. Talking to the one lone survivor of the principals at that time. The President was dead, Oswald was dead, and Ruby knew why he killed Oswald, the most important witness, living witness at that time, and the Chief Justice is advising him of his rights not to talk and we are not going to take you to Washington. So Ruby said, well, Mr. Chief Justice, you may never see meagain. Tragically he didn't. Ruby believed, and this is important, that the Dallas police gave him cancer and that's why he died. He said it to his sister and he said it to his brother. And his sister has said this - now what is interesting about that is not whether or not the Dallas police gave Ruby cancer. I think that is beside the point, but what is relevant is that Ruby believed it. Now Ruby knew what he knew about Oswald, how he got into the basement, whether he had Dallas police assistance or not. And when he said the Dallas police want me to die because of what information I have even if he was completely wrong, he raised questions that had to be thoroughly explored. Now I recently ... we all know that Ruby was supposed to be crazy he said that all the Jews all over the world and in Dallas were being killed in pogroms, and all that kind of thing, and it was all taking place because he killed Oswald , which proved that he

was irrational. But if you view it from Ruby's situation it may not be irrational - it shows a lack of touch of reality but he was out of touch with reality. He was in jail. And I discovered something a few weeks ago when I spoke at Michigan State University, and Jack Ruby's brother, Earl Ruby, drove into Detroit to Michigan State University and spoke with me for some time thereafter, I discovered something which I had never heard. I long ago gave up relying on the press for all accurate information but I just presumed that Ruby was in jail. Earl Ruby said Jack Ruby was never in the jail cell in Dallas, he said, I know for I visited him many times, sometimes I would arrive at 10:00 o'clock in the evening, I would call the police officers, they would check things out and then I would go over and see him. He was in a corridor about 50 feet long, one officer guarding him at one end with a cot in a corridor and the corridor was over the psychiatric ward - just one floor below. And there were people screaming all the time, night and day, and Ruby believed the people screamed because they were being tortured. I said why do you think he thought that and he said I don't know maybe he heard somebody say that. He was out of touch with reality. Whether or not it shows he was insane or whether he was really removed from reality - placed in that corridor and given information which was not true - I don't know. I said what did you tell him about that? He said I would tell him that it was not true. And I would say I know it was not true, Jack, and Ruby would say I have inside information.

And he said a police official told him it was true, and if a police official told him it was true then that would obviously tend to discredit anything else he might say. His prediction - everyone must remember that everyone says that Ruby was a nut, some kind of psychological nut, not the kind of person you would choose as a conspirator, said the Commission. Well, their standards may be different - I am sorry that Ruby did not qualify for the Commission's standards, but he got in, fired one shot and killed Oswald and he said I am going to die here without ever being able to tell the truth about this - and that is what happened. I think that he was quite accurate and efficient. Whatever his other difficulties might have been. The Commission should not have removed him as a possible conspirator because he did very well -/think he handled his task with great skill.

JUROR:

How much money did Ruby leave?

A. I raised that question with his brother and I have forgotten what he told me, but he did say very little, very little, whatever money there was went to lawyers. In fact one of the very interesting side features was a man named Larry Schiller, participating in a book called "The Scavengers", in which he attacks anyone who doubts the Warren Commission findings. But what he doesn't reveal in the book is that he himself was Jack Ruby's business agent. And he got Ruby's story which he sold to Herst Publications, keeping

35% for himself. The name, as I told you, is "The Scavengers". That is where the income came from primarily from the sale of that. Earl Ruby also told me that Melvin Beli and another attorney took a picture of Jack Ruby posed up in a cell and without telling Ruby about it, and sold that to a magazine. They never published it - but they got the money for it. Its hard to know how much money was paid to the Ruby interests which Ruby never received.

JUROR:

Yes, but he ran a very successful night club before he was... before the killing.

A. They said he was very much in debt. He owed the Government over $40,000.00 in tax, but there was a great deal of evidence given to the Commission through the FBI reports and others, that Ruby was the bag man, that he carried the money from the Dallas underworld to the Dallas Police Department for narcotics, et cetera in fact persons who had been associated with Ruby in some of his activities and his own confederates came forward and said that was the role Ruby played - whether there was elicit money coming or not was a question, but it seemed that there was.

MR. GARRISON:

If I remember correctly didn't Allen Dulles log a lot more time watching over the hearings than anybody else in the Commission?

A. I think he was a second to the Chief Justice. He was there far more than any other member.

Q. He was former head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

A. It was an interesting choice for the Commission.

JUROR:

In Mr. Weisberg's book he mentioned the scarcity of attendance of Commission members at the sessions, do you have any comment on that?

A. That is true. There were some 55 sessions, that Senator Russell attended only 2 of those 55 sessions. I think its true that Commission members were not present a great deal of the time, they relied upon the reports of interviews conducted by the FBI and the Secret Service. The Secret Service conducted over 1500 interviews and the FBI conducted over 25,000 interviews, the Commission itself took testimony of 552 witnesses who were called before the Commission, but that is not an accurate figure in terms of what transpired because those, over 450, never appeared before any Commission member, just the lawyers of the Commission. It included some reports that were given not even under oath. Like President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, and one or two others gave statements. I think only 94 persons out of 25,000, whose testimony the Commission considered, only 94 were questioned by one or more of the Commissioners. And not a single witness ever testified before the full Commission, there was never a single time when all the members of the Commission met - not on one occasion, to take testimony. They met to have their picture taken.

And when they were appointed they met to discuss the FBI matter and they met to present the Report to President Johnson which was televised - but there was never an occasion when all 7 members of the Commission were present to take testimony.

JUROR:

How many sessions were there with Mr. Warren in?

He was there for the majority, I don't know the exact number.

JUROR:

Was Washington aware of your personal investigation?

A. I don't know. My publisher sent a copy of the book to every member of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Q. Were you aware of any FBI men shadowing you?

A. Well, I thought they had finished that but I recently spoke to a Catholic Woman's College in Denver and after I spoke I had tea with one of the Sisters and one said there were 3 FBI agents here tonight - I said how did you know that, Sister, she said I know them because I work in the prOperty program, I know them and I recognized them. What I do, when I know they are present, is ask the audience if they will excuse me for just a moment so I can address a few words to the Agents if they are present this evening and ask them to tell Mr. Hoover to spend more time sending his agents to Dallas questioning persons who, he knows very well, may have been involved inthe assassination

and less time following me around the country writing down the same speech every single day, sometimes twice a day. And the record of the FBI would be more perfect than it is at the present time.

JUROR:

Do you believe that those who have access to this information that is being withheld, know who killed the President?

A. Well, I don't know who has access to it at the present time.

Q. But somebody does though?

A. The Chief Archivist, I presume, would be allowed to look at it, the material, but I don't know who else does who has any interest or any knowledge for example, anyone who has the basic fundamentals of the questions that have been raised who looks at the photographs of the President's body can say well this proves that the shots came from two directions. I don't know who is looking at those photographs at the present time. I do know this that I was recently on a radio program in your City with Congressman Theodore Kupperman of Manhattan and he has introduced a bill calling for an investigation of the Warren Commission's investigation and I suggested that it would be good if he could see the photographs and x-rays - I don't want to look at the photographs or x-rays myself - but I suggested that the leading pathologists at the leading universities should be permitted to

examine the documents and make a report to the American people. But of course that is not being done. I suggested to Congressman Kupperman that he might look at the photographs and x-rays and he said well, I will, that is a good idea and I will do that. I will write the Archives and ask for permission to view them and surely they will not tell a U. S. Congressman that he can't see them who has introduced a bill calling for another investigation. But they did. He is not allowed to look at them. And not one member of the Warren Commission ever looked at the photographs with the x-rays.

Q. Who is stopping him?

A. Well, its hard to know. It seems to me that the only person who can make that decision is the Chief Executive, President Johnson, I don't know who else has the authority to say to the President of the Commission that this material is not available to you. Unless there is some higher power that we don't know about - and I hope there is not.

Q. Do you have an opinion about Bob Kennedy's actions in the case especially after all this sand he has been raising about the Hoffa case?

A. Well Robert Kennedy's position is that after he is the President of the U. S. he will conduct his own investigation, and find out what happened. I think that is his feeling. And he does not want to do anything that would interfere. One must consider

his situation, he decided to run for the U. S. Senate, he was known but not very popular, he had never been a resident of New York State, and he ran a million votes behind William Javits in '60 and he was dragged in the U. S. Senate on the coattails of Lyndon Johnwon who was then extremely popular in his campaign against Barry Goldwater and Robert Kennedy was not popular. Had he prior to that time, 1964, said about this most delicate question, an emotion charged question, I do not accept the findings of the Commission regarding my brother's death, it clearly would have split the Democratic Party in half. It is not the Warren Commission - the name is The President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy - this is the Lyndon Johnson/Report Commission's - direct title. For him to say President Johnson's Commission's Report is wrong about my brother's death - we don't know who killed my brother - I think this would clearly have split the Democratic Party, including the possibility that he could have been a candidate and could have been elected. I think he is a very able politician and is very concerned about making a correct political decision. I do believe from information which I have that he sent word to Trevor Roford, the Regis Professor Of Modern History at Oxford University to keep up the good work - I think there is a great deal of support for an ongoing investigation. We know from the Manchester book - but I am not sure that is any

factual source for any information - but it is accurate about Jackie Kennedy never believed that Oswald assassinated President Kennedy. I think that Ethel Kennedy has taken that position as well and so has Teddy Kennedy. This is what I have been informed, I have not spoken with them directly. I sent some photographs to Robert Kennedy in August of 1965 and two weeks later I got a brief letter back saying the material you sent me with oovering letter has been received I just want you to know it is appreciated. Very sincerely, Robert Kennedy. He has not been hostile to the critics, I will say that. And he has never said I have read the Report, in fact he has said I have never read the Warren Report . I think this may be a good policy - and he is an excellent politician - and I think what he has done is permitted himself a great deal of room for maneuvering which seems to be a rather anti-intellectual position - he never read the documents but accepts the conclusion - and a year later his brother, Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts, took the exactly same position - almost word for word - and about a year later his brother said the same thing. I think they have permitted themselves lots of room for maneuvering, unlike the Commission members or the News Week who said they have seen all of the documents and believe the Report and therefore we

would be very embarrassed - to put it mildly - when the facts are developed. Robert Kennedy need not be and Senator Edward Kennedy need not be. I think they both developed for themselves sufficient room for maneuver so that they can say this is new evidence and now I must go with the new evidence, now I will read the Report, I could not read it before because it was my brother and too painful for me. I think that is very likely the position they will take.

MR. GARRISON:

Are there any other question you gentlemen would like to ask of Mr. Lane?

Thank you very much, Mr. Lane.